DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 802 JC 850 437

AUTHOR Renkiewicz, Nancy
TITLE Moving On: A Pilot Study of Student Transfer--California State University, Sacramento, Los Rios Community College District, University of California, Davis.
INSTITUTION Los Rios Community Coll. District, Sacramento, Calif.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 41p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Articulation (Education); Attendance Patterns; *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; *Enrollment Trends; Followup Studies; *Outcomes of Education; Postsecondary Education; Remedial Instruction; State Universities; Student Characteristics; *Transfer Programs

ABSTRACT

In 1985, a pilot study was conducted to examine student progress from the community college to the four-year university; the characteristics and completion rates of transfer students; the university academic performance of students who took remedial work at the community college prior to transfer; and the accuracy of community college transfer rate calculations. The study followed 1,182 Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD) transfer students to the University of California at Davis (UCD) and California State University at Sacramento, focusing on their patterns of enrollment, characteristics, and academic performance and persistence. Study findings included the following: (1) many students spent more than 2 years at LRCCD before transferring; (2) Asians were over-represented in the transfer population to UCD when compared to their representation in the LRCCD; (3) older transfer students earned higher grade point averages (GPA's) at their transfer institution than younger transfer students; (4) students who took remedial English at LRCCD before transferring had lower GPA's at their transfer institution than those who did not take remedial English; (5) students who took remedial math before transferring had higher transfer GPA's than those who took remedial English; (6) LRCCD transfers continued their education and received degrees in approximately the same proportion as other transfers; (7) methods used by the universities undercounted numbers of transfer students; and (8) the different methods used by the two universities to attribute students to previous schools attended resulted in inconsistent results. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259802

MOVING ON:
A PILOT STUDY OF STUDENT TRANSFER

- California State University, Sacramento
- Los Rios Community College District
- University of California, Davis

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. RENKIEWICZ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Senior Author: Nancy Renkiewicz
Sacramento City College

Los Rios Community College District
1919 Spanos Court, Sacramento, 95825

IC 850 437

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Sacramento City College 1916 — American River College 1955 — Cosumnes River College 1970

DAVID MERTES
Chancellor/Superintendent

MOVING ON: A PILOT STUDY OF TRANSFER STUDENTS

- Los Rios Community College District
- California State University - Sacramento
- University of California - Davis

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- How do students progress from the community college to the four-year university?
- What are the characteristics of students who transfer?
- What are the completion rates of transfer students?
- What is the university academic performance of students who took remedial work at the community college before transferring?
- Do the methods used to count transfers and identify what college was responsible for their prior work accurately reflect the community college transfer rates?

A 1985 pilot study, jointly sponsored by the Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD), California State University, Sacramento (CSUS), and the University of California, Davis (UCD), addresses these questions by an in-depth examination of information pertaining to transfer.

The study followed 1,812 students who took course work at one of the three Los Rios Colleges (American River College, Sacramento City College and Cosumnes River College) before transferring to CSUS or UCD in the Fall of 1980. The study focuses on patterns of enrollment, characteristics of transfer students and academic performance and persistence at both the community college and the four-year university.

Some of the major findings are as follows:

- Los Rios students transfer at different points in their college career.

  Some complete one semester at the community college, some complete one year, and others complete two years or more. Of the students officially credited to LRCCD by CSUS, 22% left prior to completing 30 units (approximately one year), and another 21% left prior to completing 56 units (approximately two years). For UCD, 15% transferred before completing 30 units, and an additional 21% transferred before completing 56 units.

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 • (916) 920-7821

- Because the majority of students attend the community college on a part-time or intermittent basis, many students spend more than two years at LRCCD before transferring to a four-year university.

  Forty-seven percent of the LRCCD transfers who attended CSUS in Fall 1980 had attended LRCCD prior to Fall 1978. Twenty-five percent of the UCD transfers had attended LRCCD before Fall 1978. Previous Los Rios research indicates that only one quarter of LRCCD students take a full-time credit load of 12 units or more.

- Asians are over-represented in the LRCCD transfer population to UCD, when compared to their representation in LRCCD, and Blacks, Caucasians and Hispanics are under-represented. At CSUS, Asians and Caucasians are slightly over-represented, Hispanics under-represented, and Blacks attend in about the same proportion.

  Asians represented 7.1% of the LRCCD students and 23.2% of the transfers to UCD. Hispanics were 6.6% of the LRCCD students but were only 5.1% of the UCD transfers. Blacks accounted for 10% of the LRCCD population but only 6.3% of the transfers to UCD. At CSUS, Asians accounted for 9.9% of the transfers, Caucasians 68.5%; Hispanics 5.7%; and Blacks 9.6%.

- Older students who transferred from LRCCD earned higher grade point averages at their transfer institution than younger transfer students.

  Students twenty-five years and over earned higher GPAs than students 17 - 24 at both CSUS and UCD. The highest GPAs were earned by those students thirty years of age and older.

- Students with deficient English skills who took remedial English at LRCCD before transferring to UCD or CSUS have lower grade point averages than those students who did not take remedial English.

  Of the students who took remedial English at LRCCD, thirty-five percent have a 2.5 or better GPA at UCD. Fifty-nine percent of the non-remedial students have a 2.5 or better GPA. At CSUS, fifty-seven percent of the students who took remedial English at LRCCD have a 2.5 or better GPA. Seventy percent of the non-remedial students have a 2.5 or better.

- Students with deficient math skills who took remedial math at LRCCD before transferring to UCD and CSUS have higher grade point averages after transferring than those students who took remedial English.

  Of the students who took remedial math at LRCCD, forty-one percent have a 2.5 or better GPA at UCD. Sixty-five percent of the non-remedial students have a 2.5 or better. At CSUS sixty-nine percent of the students who took remedial math at LRCCD have a 2.5 or better GPA. Sixty-six percent of the non-remedial students have a 2.5 or better.

- Students who were credited to LRCCD continue their education and receive degrees in approximately the same proportion as other transfer students and at a slightly higher percentage than undergraduates who began their studies at the university.

  Graduation rates of junior transfers to UCD average 67% after three years. In Fall 1984, LRCCD transfers showed 65.3% had received a degree and 4.1% were still enrolled. The completion percentage for native undergraduates who entered UCD as freshmen is 64% five years after entrance. At CSUS in Fall 1984, 42% had received a degree and 14% were still enrolled. The completion percentage for all undergraduates at CSUS is 45%.

- Methods used by the universities to attribute students to previous schools undercount the contribution of the community college in educating transfer students.

  If all former LRCCD students who transferred to CSUS and UCD in Fall 1980 are counted, numbers of Los Rios transfers increase 41% (UCD) and 11% (CSUS) over the universities official counts.

- The different methods used by the two universities to attribute students to previous schools attended result in inconsistent information.

  CSUS attributes students to the last school attended, regardless of the amount of work completed at the last school. UCD attributes students to the school thought to be most responsible for establishing UCD eligibility. Thus the number of transfers counted by each university mean different things.

For further information or a copy of the complete study contact Nancy Renkiewicz, Senior Author, Sacramento City College, 449-7386.

NR:jh

MOVING ON:
A PILOT STUDY OF STUDENT TRANSFER

- California State University, Sacramento
- Los Rios Community College District
- University of California, Davis

Senior Author: Nancy Renkiewicz
Sacramento City College

Los Rios Community College District
1919 Spanos Court, Sacramento, 95825

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Principal Research Consultants:	Larry Glasmire, CSUS Bonnie MacKenzie, UCD
Advisory Committee:	Sandra Barkdull, CSUS Janis Cox Coffey, LRCCD Larry Glasmire, CSUS Gerry Helland, CSUS Peter Hirsch, CACC Robert Jensen, formerly LRCCD Richard Krolak, CSUC Beth Lee, LRCCD Yvonne Marsh, UCD Bonnie MacKenzie, UCD Maynard Skinner, UCD
Data Processing Assistance:	Randall Jones Joe Poole Marianne Rasor Jerry Stypes
Manuscript Production:	Ann Lynch
Manuscript Review/Editing:	Janis Cox Coffey Larry Glasmire Larry Hendrick Peter Hirsch Val Hytholt Beth Lee Bonnie MacKenzie Barbara Mertes Ann Reed
Printing Production:	Gregory Washington

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND 1

METHODOLOGY 2

STUDY DESIGN AND LIMITATIONS 3

STUDY FINDINGS 6

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS 22

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH 24

Appendix A A-1

Appendix B B-1

Appendix C C-1

MOVING ON: A PILOT STUDY OF STUDENT TRANSFER

Los Rios Community College District
California State University, Sacramento
University of California, Davis

August 15, 1985

BACKGROUND

The transfer function of the California Community Colleges has been a major focus of discussion in the 1980s. As evidence of this interest, one need only look at the volumes of reports, the number of committees and the multitude of press clippings related to transfer.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) has increased efforts to study the relationships among all segments of higher education. In addition to publishing the Annual Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics each year, CPEC recently launched a major effort to provide recommendations for increasing transfer rates. The Ad Hoc Committee on Community College Transfer Function established in 1983 heard testimony from the field and published part of this testimony in Views from the Field on Community College Transfer and eventually published Reaffirming California's Commitment to Transfer.

The University of California has begun to gather information on community college students who transfer to the University for a two-part study initiated by the Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach Services. The first report of the study, A Profile of California Community College Transfer Students at the University of California, prepared by Frank S. Baratta and Ed C. Apodaca (September 1984), presents statistics on the number and characteristics of the transfer students over the past three years. The second report will focus on persistence, performance and needs of transfer students. Combined, the two reports will provide information for the University to review its role in assisting the community college transfer students.

Paralleling the CPEC activity, the Community College Chancellor's Office published a major report, Transfer Education: California Community Colleges.

Recently, additional attention to the transfer issue was generated by the establishment of the Master Plan Review Commission to study the major missions of the higher education segments in California and by the Berman-Weiler study of community colleges for the California Business Roundtable.

Many of these studies stress and suggest the need for inter-segmental cooperation in studying and improving transfer rates. Many also stress the need for improved information related to special groups of students, e.g., ethnic minorities, eligible vs. ineligible students, etc.

Each of these reports provides increased knowledge of the transfer function and recommendations for improvement of that function. All of the studies have one attribute in common: they are system-wide studies. System-wide studies, while comprehensive in nature, are hampered by their inability to acquire consistent data across a large number of colleges and their inability to do in-depth probing into data and definitional problems.

The following study, through inter-segmental cooperation, develops methods and preliminary data for an in-depth examination of the characteristics and academic performance of community college transfer students.

This study was initially conceived as part of a larger research agenda developed by the Commission on Research of the California Association of Community Colleges. (Appendix A). The research agenda consisted of three parts: 1) Student Records Study of Community College students; 2) Student Records Study of CSU/UC students; 3) Survey of Reverse Transfer Students. The Reverse Transfer portion of the agenda was completed in 1982. This study addresses the second topic on the agenda, a study of community college students who transfer to UC or CSU.

Jointly sponsored by the Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD), California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) and University of California, Davis (UCD), the study follows 1812 students who transferred to CSUS and UCD in Fall, 1980 and who previously attended one or more of the three LRCCD colleges: American River College, Sacramento City College, and Cosumnes River College. Representatives from each segment met as a group to develop the study questions and design. Student records data from each college and university were used to obtain information on patterns of enrollment, student characteristics, and academic performance. The analysis portion of the study was primarily done by LRCCD staff with periodic review and assistance by staff at CSUS and UCD.

METHODOLOGY

The following process was used to collect information:

1) Computer tapes were generated by UCD and CSUS to identify all undergraduates who entered each university in Fall 1980. These tapes, containing an agreed-upon set of data elements for each student and academic performance information current through Spring 1984, were sent to the Los Rios Community College District Data Processing Center.

2) The data processing center matched the student identification numbers that appeared on the CSUS and UCD tapes with the student numbers in the LRCCD master file to identify students who were in attendance at LRCCD prior to Fall 1980. Matched students were included in the study group. Additional data elements from LRCCD files were added to each matched student record from UCD and CSUS to create a study master file.

3) Additional information from other sources, e.g., admissions and records, were provided by UCD and CSUS to do special analyses.

4) SPSS-X was used to conduct the statistical analysis of the data.

STUDY DESIGN AND LIMITATIONS

The study design (Appendix B) was drafted after a number of joint meetings among the three segments. As conceived, the design was ambitious. The researchers wished to provide information at a depth that would give college personnel some guidance in designing programs and services to improve the transfer rate. Because little research of this type had been conducted in the past it was hoped that the project would serve as a model for other colleges intending to do in-depth analysis on the transfer issue.

As the study progressed it became apparent that certain questions specified in the study design could not be answered, given available data and resources. So the design was then modified to include the following study questions:

1. How do official counts of transfer students compare with counts obtained from other student records?

2. How many credits do students complete at the community college before graduating?

3. Were most students who transferred to UCD and CSUS eligible from high school?

4. Do students who are eligible from high school transfer sooner than ineligible students?

5. What was the average length of time from initial enrollment in LRCCD to transfer in Fall 1980 to CSUS and UCD?

6. What are the characteristics of students who transfer to CSUS and UCD?

7. What is the academic performance of community college transfers at the community college prior to transfer and at the four-year college after transfer?

8. How do students who take remedial courses at LRCCD perform academically when they transfer to CSUS and UCD?

9. How many LRCCD transfer students persist and receive a degree?

As a pilot study without separate funding, the study required considerable donations of time by researchers to explicate study issues and iron out data definitions. Each new data run presented more questions and required more meetings to carefully examine the data for discrepancies and to check computer runs against benchmark historical data. Agreements as to what was feasible were narrowed as new problems arose. The process was a lengthy one.

Early in the study design phase it was determined that compatible data elements and definitions did not exist among the three institutions in some areas. Data elements that were not available from both universities without extensive file searches or programming are listed below. Collection of some of these elements was deemed infeasible for the purposes of the present pilot effort.

DIFFERENCES IN DATA AVAILABILITY AMONG INSTITUTIONS

1. Degree data. CSUS was unable to provide, without considerable difficulty, information on whether students had obtained a degree, were still enrolled, or were not in attendance. This information was finally obtained by examining transcripts of a randomly selected subsample of the study group.

2. Eligibility to attend UCD/CSUS from high school. Information regarding high school eligibility to attend CSUS and UCD was considered an important aspect of the study, but the information was only available at UCD. The study design initially suggested obtaining this information for CSUS students by contacting high schools, obtaining transcripts, and determining eligibility. Later in the study this method was discarded because of lack of adequate resources to complete the task.

3. Transfer units from colleges not included in the study. LRCCD student records were limited to work taken at LRCCD, nor was transfer information for particular schools easily available from CSUS. Therefore, it was difficult to isolate students who had only taken work at LRCCD from students who had taken work at other colleges.

4. GPAs. Cumulative GPA was readily available at each university, but term-by-term GPA was not. Also, during the period of the study, CSUS employed "nonpunitive" grading in lower division courses (no Ds or Fs were given). Thus UCD and CSUS GPAs are not comparable for students who took lower division courses at CSUS.

5. Coursework taken at CSUS and UCD after transfer. Neither university could easily provide coursework information in summary fashion. In particular, it was not possible to detect enrollment in remedial courses at UCD or CSUS without extensive file searches.

6. Measures of high school achievement. Measures of high school achievement common to both universities were desired but were not available. CSUS collects overall high school GPA, and UCD collects GPA for only A-F requirements. Overall HS GPA was only available at UCD through manual examination of admissions records. SAT/ACT scores were not available (or always required) for transfer students at either university.

In addition to these data availability problems, the selection of the study population proved problematic at first. Initially the study design included students entering UCD and CSUS in both Fall 1979 and 1980. Without using two years of data, analysis of certain UCD student groups would be difficult to accomplish because the numbers would be too small. However, using two years of data was not possible because certain 1979 students from LRCCD had already been purged from the LRCCD student master file. Therefore, the study could only use 1980 student data. This allowed enough time for students to graduate but limited analysis of special sub-groups such as ethnic minorities and academic major groupings. An additional concern was that 1980 was the first year of a new student record system at UCD, a fact which raised some concerns about the possibility of missing or erroneous data.

Early data runs included duplicate records for students who had attended more than one LRCCD college. A program was written to combine records and report only one record per student. Preliminary runs also included students who had attended LRCCD after they had enrolled in UCD or CSUS. The data were modified to include only those students who had attended LRCCD prior to their enrollment in UCD or CSUS.

A major focus of the study was to investigate differences in how CSUS and UCD attribute students to previous schools. This practice is called crediting. At CSUS, the Admissions Office credits a student to the last school attended. At UCD, the system for crediting a student to a particular school is much more complex. In general, a UCD student is credited to the school having the most responsibility for his or her UC eligibility. If no one institution is responsible or if the student is admitted by special action, the student is credited to the last school attended. Several exceptions to these general rules complicate the situation further. (See Appendix C)

This study shows there were a number of students who attended LRCCD colleges and were not credited to LRCCD. The data presented need further analysis. Missing source school designation was a problem with UCD data at the time of this writing. The UCD researcher and the LRCCD programmer are investigating why the source schools are missing for some students.

The study also discovered a large number of students who transferred with 60 units or more from LRCCD to CSUS who were not credited to LRCCD. After closer examination, it was determined that if a LRCCD student attended CSUS, dropped out for a semester and then re-enrolled, the student would be re-credited with CSUS being listed as the source school.

STUDY FINDINGS

Patterns of Enrollment

1. How do official counts of transfer students compare with counts obtained from other student records?

How students are credited is a somewhat complicated process and may obscure actual flow patterns that exist among the community colleges and the four-year institutions. Table I shows the different numbers obtained from various sources.

TABLE I
NUMBER OF STUDENTS FROM LRCCD ATTENDING
CSUS AND UCD IN FALL 1980

	Student I.D. Numbers Matched on Data Files	Number from Official Admissions and Records	Numbers on Study File Who Were Credited to LRCCD
CSUS	1558	1389	1174
UCD	254	151	121

For example, when student records from LRCCD and CSUS were matched, it was determined that 1558 students attended LRCCD prior to attending CSUS. The CSUS study file, however, indicated only 1174 of these matched students were actually credited to LRCCD, while the official admissions and records office figures show 1389 students credited to Los Rios. The study group anticipated that a larger number of students would be matched from records than were officially credited; however, the differences between those credited by the admissions and records office and credited in the existing data base were not anticipated. CSUS and UCD are studying the discrepancies to determine other explanations.

2. How many credits do students complete at the community college before transferring?

The traditional view of the student flow pattern as two years of community college work followed by two years at a four- year college is not born out in the data (see Tables II and III). There were more students transferring to UCD as freshmen (39%) than as juniors (33%) and over one-quarter of CSUS transfers entered as freshmen.

Students who transfer to UCD and CSUS do so at different points in their career. The initial level of entrance at UCD for the study group was generally lower than for CSUS. The initial level of entrance to UCD was: Freshman 37.8%, Sophomore 15.7%, Junior 42.5%, Senior 1.6%, and other 2.4%. At CSUS the initial level of entrance was: Freshman 19.1%, Sophomore 24.1%, Junior 53.5%, Senior 3.3%.

To explore this pattern further, the study examined students who were credited to LRCCD. One might assume that these students would be most likely to enter CSUS or UCD as juniors. However, 39.6% of the CSUS transfers credited to LRCCD entered as freshmen or sophomores and 27.3% of the UCD transfers entered before their junior year.

Since it appears that many students do transfer before they reach junior status, it is not surprising that in some cases community college sophomore level classes are under-enrolled.

Table II shows that many uncredited students took large numbers of units at LRCCD, although the general tendency was for uncredited students to have fewer LRCCD units than credited students.

Not surprisingly, 37.2% of the CSUS students who were credited to other colleges or high schools took under 12 units at LRCCD. The 17.2% who completed more than 60 units at LRCCD but who were not credited may be explained by the fact that students who stopped out for a semester after entering CSUS were recoded from LRCCD to CSUS as last school attended. However, 26.5% (101 students) took between 12-60 units at LRCCD and were credited to another college or high school. Without a detailed study of transcripts it is impossible to determine why these students were credited to some other college. However, student mobility and the practice of crediting students to last school attended are probable reasons.

Almost half of the UCD students credited to other schools completed less than 12 units at LRCCD and 57% credited to LRCCD took over sixty units. What is interesting to note is that 27.9% who completed more than one year of work at LRCCD were credited to some other school. As is the case with CSUS, further study will have to be done to determine why this pattern of crediting occurred.

TABLE II

TRANSFERS TO CSUS: NUMBER OF UNITS COMPLETED AT LRCCD
BY CREDITED AND NON-CREDITED STUDENTS
AND TOTAL STUDY POPULATION

Number of Units	Students Credited to LRCCD (N=1174)	Students Credited to Other Schools (N=384)	Total Study Population (N=1558)
0-11.9	9.4%	37.2%	16.2%
12.0-29.9	12.4%	10.4%	11.9%
30.0-44.9	10.9%	6.5%	9.8%
45.0-55.9	10.6%	6.0%	9.5%
56.0-60.0	8.9%	3.6%	7.6%
Over 60	46.4%	17.2%	39.2%
Zero Units (Missing Data)	1.4%	19.1%	5.8%

TABLE III

TRANSFERS TO UCD: NUMBER OF UNITS COMPLETED AT LRCCD
BY CREDITED AND NON-CREDITED STUDENTS
AND TOTAL STUDY POPULATION

Number of Units	Students Credited to LRCCD (N=121)	Students Credited to Other Schools (N=133)	Total Study Population (N=254)
0-11.9	1.7%	49.6%	26.8%
12.0-29.9	13.2%	11.3%	12.2%
30.0-44.9	11.6%	6.8%	9.1%
45.0-55.9	9.1%	4.5%	6.7%
56.0-60.0	7.4%	5.3%	6.3%
Over 60	57.0%	11.3%	33.1%
Zero Units (Missing Data)	--	11.2%	5.8%

3. Were most students who transferred to UCD and CSUS eligible from high school?

This question can only be answered for the UCD population studied because eligibility data was not available for CSUS. Of the matched students, 142 or 55.9% were eligible from high school and 112 or 44.1% obtained eligibility through community college, four-year college, or special admission status.

4. Do students who are eligible from high school transfer sooner than ineligible students?

The study was only able to determine high school eligibility for UCD students. Table IV shows the units taken at LRCCD by UCD transfers who were high school eligible and those who were not.

TABLE IV
NUMBER OF UNITS COMPLETED AT LRCCD BY UCD TRANSFER STUDENTS
WHO WERE ELIGIBLE TO ATTEND UCD FROM HIGH SCHOOL
AND THOSE WHO WERE NOT ELIGIBLE

Total Units Completed	Eligible to Attend UCD From High School (N=142)	Not Eligible to Attend UCD From High School (N=112)
0-11.9	34.5%	17.0%
12.0-29.9	11.3%	13.4%
30.0-44.9	8.5%	9.8%
45.0-55.9	5.6%	8.0%
56.0-60.0	4.9%	8.0%
Over 60	28.2%	39.3%
Zero Units (Missing Data)	7.0%	4.5%

Students who were not eligible for UC when they graduated from high school generally took more units at LRCCD than other students. A smaller percentage of high school eligible students, 33.1%, completed the equivalent of a two year program (56 or more units) at LRCCD as compared to non-high school eligibles, 47.3%. Forty-six percent of the high school eligible students transferred before completing one year, and 14.1% transferred after one year but before completing 56 transfer units at Los Rios. In the non-high school eligible group, 30% completed one year or less before transferring. This group may include students who had obtained additional units from other community colleges prior to transferring.

5. What was the average length of time from initial enrollment in LRCCD to transfer to CSUS and UCD in Fall 1980?

Transfers to UCD spend a shorter amount of time at the community college before transferring than do transfers to CSUS. Seventy-five percent of the LRCCD students transferring to UCD in Fall 1980 were first enrolled in LRCCD in 1978, 1979 or 1980. As Table V shows, this is not the case for CSUS, where only slightly more than one-half of the students first enrolled in 1978, 1979 or 1980. Because of the length of time it took for many CSUS transfers to complete work at LRCCD, it may be assumed that many of these students attended LRCCD on a part-time basis. In Planning For Change, Fall 1984 Enrollment Update, Janis Coffey reports that only one-fourth of students enrolled in LRCCD take a full-time credit load of 12 units or more.

TABLE V
THE PERCENT OF FALL 1980 TRANSFER STUDENTS
BY THEIR FIRST YEAR OF ENROLLMENT
AT LRCCD

First Year of LRCCD Enrollment	LRCCD Transfer Students CSUS (N=1558)	UCD (N=254)
1975 or earlier	15.4%	5.9%
1976	10.2%	6.7%
1977	21.1%	12.2%
1978	21.3%	26.8%
1979	18.3%	25.2%
1980	13.7%	23.2%

Characteristics

6. What are the characteristics of students who transfer to CSUS and UCD?

The study examined major characteristics of age, gender, ethnicity for the total transfer population.

The age range for students transferring to UCD was between 17 years and 41 years. The high school eligible transfers were much younger (84.5% were under 22 years) than the students who were not high school eligible (51.8% were under 22 years).

The average CSUS transfer was older than the UCD transfer. The age range for students attending CSUS was from 17-71 years, a much larger age span than UCD. Almost forty-three percent were under 22 years of age and 57% were 22 or older.

Table VI shows the male/female distribution in the LRCCD service area, the LRCCD student population and the LRCCD transfers to UCD and CSUS. Service area is used as a comparison because it includes the number of persons 18 years of age and over who could be potential students at LRCCD. Compared to the LRCCD student population, males were over-represented in the transfer population and females were under-represented.

TABLE VI

GENDER OF STUDENTS: 1980 CENSUS, LRCCD POPULATION, LRCCD TRANSFERS TO CSUS AND UCD

	1980 Census College Service Area (N=904,814)	1980 LRCCD Students (N=44,341)	LRCCD Fall, 1980 Transfers CSUS (N=1558)	LRCCD Fall, 1980 Transfers UCD (N=254)
Female	51.8%	55.1%	52.5%	50.0%
Male	48.2%	44.9%	47.5%	50.0%

Recent studies point to the lack of minority students who transfer to four-year colleges and universities. Table VII shows the percentage of the 1980 college service area population in each ethnic category. These percentages can then be compared with the percent of LRCCD students enrolled in 1980 and the percent of LRCCD transfers to CSUS and UCD. Asians were over-represented in the transfer population to UCD. Even though Asians account for only 5% in the population and 7.1% at LRCCD, they account for 23.2% of the transfers to UCD. This finding corresponds to the recent CPEC study finding reported in Director's Report, 1985. In this 1983 study, Asians accounted for only 6.3% of the high school graduates but enrolled 17.3% of the first time-freshmen in the UC system.

In comparison with the LRCCD service area, blacks were slightly over-represented in the LRCCD student population and at CSUS, and Hispanics were under-represented at LRCCD, CSUS and UCD.

TABLE VII

ETHNICITY OF STUDENTS: LRCCD SERVICE AREA 1980 CENSUS, LRCCD 1980 STUDENTS, LRCCD TRANSFERS TO CSUS AND UCD FALL, 1980

	1980 Census College Service Area (N=904,814)	LRCCD Students 1980 (N=44,341)	LRCCD Fall, 1980 Transfers CSUS (N=1558)	LRCCD Fall, 1980 Transfers UCD (N=254)
American Indian	1.2%	1.4%	2.1%	1.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander/ Filipino	5.0%	7.1%	9.9%	23.2%
Black	6.5%	10.0%	9.6%	6.3%
White	77.6%	66.3%	68.5%	60.6%
Hispanic	9.1%	6.6%	5.7%	5.1%
Other/Not Coded	.6%	8.6%	4.2%	3.6%

Because these students transferred before the inauguration of special programs within the Los Rios District aimed at increasing minority transfer students, it will be interesting to see if there are significant changes in these percentages within the next few years.

Academic Performance

7. What is the academic performance of community college transfers at the community college prior to transfer and at the four-year college after transfer?

Table VIII shows grade point averages of UCD transfers before and after transferring. A difference of .58 was found between UCD cumulative grade point averages (GPA) and LRCCD cumulative averages. When grade point averages were examined for students eligible and not eligible from high school, the differences in UCD cumulative GPA were more pronounced. Eligible students had a difference of .50, and ineligible students a difference of .70.

TABLE VIII

CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF LRCCD STUDENTS
WHO TRANSFERRED TO UCD

	Total Transfers To UCD (N=254)	Eligible to Attend UCD From High School (N=142)	Not Eligible to Attend UCD From High School (N=112)
Grade point average at LRCCD for all work	3.23	3.26	3.20
Cumulative grade point average at UCD	2.65	2.76	2.50
Difference	.58	.50	.70

Table IX shows grade point averages for transfers to CSUS. Students who transferred to CSUS had lower LRCCD GPAs than UCD transfers (2.99 versus 3.20) but they experienced proportionally less decline than students who transferred to UCD.

TABLE IX

CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF LRCCD STUDENTS
WHO TRANSFERRED TO CSUS

	Total Study Population (N=1558)
Grade point average at LRCCD for all work	2.99
Cumulative grade point average at CSUS	2.72
Difference	.27

Grade point averages were obtained by gender, age and ethnicity. Table X shows male and female GPAs for the LRCCD transfers to CSUS and UCD. Grade point averages tend to be slightly higher for females at both universities.

TABLE X

CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF MALES AND FEMALES TRANSFERRING TO CSUS AND UCD

	LRCCD Fall 1980 Transfer Students	
	CSUS GPA (N=1558)	UCD GPA (N=254)
Female	2.82	2.72
Male	2.61	2.58

When grade point averages are displayed by age categories, students twenty-five years and over earn better grades than students 17-24 years old at both CSUS and UCD. The poorest GPAs for both universities occur in the 21-24 category. Table XI shows results for both colleges by age groups and includes the number of students in each group.

TABLE XI

CSUS AND UCD CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF LRCCD TRANSFERS BY AGE CATEGORIES

	LRCCD Fall 1980 Transfers			
	CSUS (N=1558)		UCD (N=254)	
Age	GPA	N	GPA	N
0-17	2.66	100	2.65	64
18-20	2.73	554	2.64	113
21-24	2.61	369	2.44	31
25-29	2.84	215	2.76	32
30-39	2.84	155	2.92	11
40-99	2.74	110	2.96	2
Missing Cases	--	55	--	1

Grade point averages by ethnicity are shown in Table XII. Some caution should be used when interpreting this data because of the small numbers reported in some of the ethnic categories. The averages are based on cumulative GPA as of Spring 1984.

TABLE XII

CSUS AND UCD CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES BY ETHNICITY
FOR LRCCD TRANSFERS TO CSUS AND UCD

Ethnicity	LRCCD Fall 1980 Transfers			
	CSUS (N=1558)		UCD (N=254)	
	GPA	N	GPA	N
American Indian	2.65	29	2.49	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.87	128	2.69	57
Black	2.27	146	2.01	16
White	2.83	1028	2.72	154
Hispanic	2.59	86	2.39	13
Filipino	2.40	22	2.35	2
Other	2.79	41	3.01	5
Missing Cases	--	78	--	4

Age, gender, and ethnicity data were combined in an attempt to see if particular groups of students emerged who might need special help either before transfer or at the transfer university. However, the numbers reported in each category were too small to draw any conclusions at this time.

8. How do students who take remedial courses at the Los Rios Community College District perform academically when they transfer to CSUS and UCD?

Students who had taken remedial courses at LRCCD before transferring to CSUS and UCD were separately identified, and their academic performance at CSUS and UCD was examined. The study attempted to determine how many of the transfers had taken remedial work and how well they were doing at their transfer institutions. Remedial enrollments were split into two groups, English and mathematics. A student taking both remedial English and math at LRCCD was counted in both areas. Remedial was arbitrarily defined as being any English course below Freshman Composition/English 1A and any math course below intermediate algebra. Table XIII shows the percentage of CSUS and UCD transfers who took remedial English and math at LRCCD. UCD students were divided into two groups, those who were eligible to attend UCD from high school, and whose who were not.

TABLE XIII

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO TOOK REMEDIAL ENGLISH OR MATH COURSES WHILE ATTENDING LRCCD

	LRCCD Transfers CSUS (N=1558)	LRCCD Transfers UCD (N=254)	
English (below college level Composition/ English 1A)	25.4%	13.8%	UC High School Eligible Students 21% Not Eligible 79%
Math (below Intermediate Algebra/ Math 13)	16.0%	6.7%	UC High School Eligible Students 35% Not Eligible 65%

Fourteen percent of UCD transfers had taken remedial English at LRCCD, as had 25% of CSUS transfers. Comparable figures for remedial math were 7% (UCD) and 16% (CSUS).

As might be expected, fewer eligible students took remedial courses than non-eligible students. For example, of the 13.8% who took remedial English, 79% were students who were not eligible to attend UCD from high school. Also, a higher proportion of students took remedial English. New math requirements at CSUS may increase the amount of remedial math in the future for CSUS transfers.

The study hypothesized that students who had taken remedial English or math at the community college would not be expected to do as well as students who did not take remediation of any type. This assumption was true for English at both universities, but not true for math at CSUS. As shown in Table XIV, UCD transfer students, who had taken LRCCD remedial English and math did not perform as well as their non-remedial counterparts. However, at CSUS there was almost no difference in CSUS GPA between students who did and did not take remedial math, and relatively small differences existed between students who did and did not take remedial English.

These results may be important information for counselors. English skills appear to be quite important to earning a 2.5 or better at UCD since only a little more than one-third of remedial English students earned at least a 2.5 at UCD. Further studies with articulation groups could be used to pinpoint which skills are needed for success. Counselors could then advise students more appropriately about their skill levels and chances for success at UCD.

Further research would also indicate the nature and extent of the English difficulties that necessitated remedial work. Some of these students may have been recent immigrants or non-immigrant minorities with language skill deficiencies. The influence of academic major at CSUS and UCD should also be examined.

Since this study was completed prior to extensive changes in the assessment process and remedial curriculum at LRCCD, this area should be explored further at a later date to see what effect the new system has on student progress.

TABLE XIV

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO EARNED A 2.5 OR BETTER CUMULATIVE GPA AT CSUS AND UCD AND THEIR REMEDIATION WORK AT LRCCD

	LRCCD Fall 1980 Transfers	
	CSUS (N=482)	UCD (N=99)
Remedial English Students at LRCCD	57.3%	35.2%
No Remedial English	69.7%	58.9%
Remedial Math Students at LRCCD	69.1%	41.1%
No Remedial Math	66.1%	65.2%

Persistence At The Two-Year And Four-Year College

9. How many transfer students persist and receive a degree?

One measure of college persistence is degree completion. This study measured how many students received the AA/AS degree at LRCCD and how many received the BA/BS degree from CSUS and UCD.

A small percentage of the study group of transfers received the AA/AS degree at LRCCD (only 22.4% of the UCD transfers and 36.6% of the CSUS transfers). Some of them did not receive the degree because they did not take an adequate number of units at LRCCD before transferring. A larger percentage of students earned 60 units or more at LRCCD than the percentage who actually received the degree (33% versus 22% at UCD and 39% versus 36% at CSUS). Students who earned 60 or more units may not have obtained the degree because they did not consider it to be an important objective to achieve if they had definite plans to complete their BA/BS degree. Although we can't be sure about the reasons why, we can be reasonably sure that not all the students who were eligible to receive the degree took advantage of that opportunity.

The study examined the BA/BS degree status of the transfer students as of Spring 1984. Records were not available on tape for CSUS; therefore, a random sample of 300 transcripts was examined to determine the percentage of students who had graduated, who were still enrolled, and who were no longer enrolled.

Table XV shows the percentages for CSUS and UCD in each of the categories.

TABLE XV

SPRING 1984 DEGREE STATUS FOR STUDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM LRCCD TO CSUS OR UCD IN FALL 1980

	CSUS*	UCD (N=254)
Received degree	41.7%	48.0%
Still enrolled	14.3%	19.3%
Left without a degree	44.0%	32.7%

* Results based on a sample of 300 students.

Additional analysis of the UCD degree data was possible because the information appeared on the master student tape. Tables XVI and XVII are different ways of looking at the graduation rate by type of student. Table XVI shows rates for LRCCD transfer students who were high school eligible and those who were not, and Table XVII displays rates for only those students who were officially credited to LRCCD.

TABLE XVI

UCD DEGREE STATUS FOR STUDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM LRCCD: BY HIGH SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY

	Eligible to Attend UCD from High School (N=142)	Not Eligible to Attend UCD from High School (N=112)
Received degree	50.0%	45.5%
Still enrolled	21.8%	16.1%
Left without a degree	28.2%	38.4%

TABLE XVII

UCD DEGREE STATUS FOR STUDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM LRCCD AND WHO WERE OFFICIALLY CREDITED TO LRCCD

	Transfers Credited to LRCCD (N=121)
Received degree	65.3%
Still enrolled in 1984	4.1%
Left without a degree	30.6%

These graduation rates are somewhat comparable to completion rates experienced by UCD and CSUS in the past. The percentage of students who graduate within five years after entering UCD as freshmen is 64% and the percent of junior transfers who graduate within three years is 67%. The percentage of all CSUS undergraduate students who receive a degree within five years is 45%.

The study examined the mean number of units taken at LRCCD by UCD degree completion status. Table XVIII shows the mean number of units taken at LRCCD by those students who received the degree, those students who were still enrolled and those students who left without a degree. Means are shown for the total UCD population and also for sub-groups within the population. Those students who received the degree tended to take more units at LRCCD than those who were still enrolled or left without a degree. As expected, students who were not eligible to attend UCD from high school took more units at LRCCD than those students who were eligible. Likewise, more units were taken by those students who were credited to LRCCD than those who were credited to some other institution. What is more difficult to interpret is the lower mean number of units taken at LRCCD by students who left without a degree.

The most plausible explanation has to do with time of enrollment at UCD. Students who have graduated probably had to have some prior work at LRCCD in order to have graduated within the allotted period of time. Likewise, students who are still enrolled probably entered UCD early as freshmen. However, it is impossible to tell when the "students who left" entered. Some may have entered as freshmen and others as juniors.

Further analysis of "students who left" will be done in the future to try to determine the characteristics of this student group.

TABLE XVIII

MEAN NUMBER OF UNITS COMPLETED AT LRCCD BY UCD DEGREE COMPLETION STATUS AND STUDENT SUB-GROUPS

	Received BA/BS		Still Enrolled		Left Without Degree	
Student Sub-Groups	Mean Units	N	Mean Units	N	Mean Units	N
UCD Total Population (N=254)	50.9	122	13.9	49	36.2	83
Students Who Were Eligible to Attend UCD from High School (N=142)	46.7	71	6.8	31	29.5	40
Students Who Were Not Eligible to Attend UCD from High School (N=112)	56.8	51	26.1	18	42.4	43
Students Who Were Credited to LRCCD (N=121)	60.7	79	50.0	5	52.9	37
Students Who Were Not Credited to LRCCD (N=133)	33.0	43	9.8	44	22.7	46

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The following items summarize the major findings of the LRCCD/CSUS/UCD Transfer Study.

1. Current UCD and CSUS methods of crediting transfer students to their sending institution are inconsistent.

   The two universities participating in this study used totally different methods for determining how a student is credited to a sending institution. Further research needs to be conducted to determine whether practices vary within the UC and CSU systems.

2. Methods used by universities to attribute students to previous schools undercount the contribution of the community college in educating transfer students.

   If all former LRCCD students who transferred to CSUS and UCD in Fall 1980 are counted, numbers of Los Rios transfers increase 41% (UCD) and 11% (CSUS) over the universities' official counts.

3. Accurate tracking of students' progress from the community college to four-year universities requires improved data bases in all segments.

   This study was hampered because of incomplete student histories which failed to show high school eligibility for CSUS, total units completed at all community colleges attended, and graduation and persistence rates.

4. Students transfer at different points in their college career. Some attend for one semester, some complete one year, and others complete two years or more.

   Of the students officially credited to LRCCD by CSUS, 22% left prior to completing one year (30 units), and another 21% left prior to two years (56 units). For UCD, 15% transferred before completing one year, and an additional 21% transferred before two years.

5. Because the majority of students attend the community college on a part-time basis, many spend more than two years at LRCCD before transferring to a four-year university.

   Forty-seven percent of the LRCCD transfers who attended CSUS in the fall of 1980 were enrolled in LRCCD prior to Fall 1978. Twenty-five percent of the UCD transfers were enrolled in Los Rios before Fall 1978.

6. Older students who transferred from LRCCD earned higher grade point averages at their transfer institution than younger transfer students.

   Students twenty-five and over earned higher GPAs than students 17-24 at both CSUS and UCD. The highest GPAs were earned by those students thirty years of age and older.

7. Female students who transferred from LRCCD earned higher grade point averages at their transfer institutions.

   Los Rios female transfers to UCD and CSUS earned approximately .20 higher GPA than their male counterparts.

8. Asians are over-represented in the transfer population to UCD, when compared to their representation in LRCCD, and Blacks, Caucasians and Hispanics are under-represented. At CSUS Asians and Caucasians are slightly over-represented and Hispanics under-represented.

   Asians represented 7.1% of the LRCCD students and 23.2% of the transfers to UCD. Hispanics were 6.6% of the LRCCD students but were only 5.1% of the transfers. At CSUS, Asians accounted for 9.9% of the transfers; Caucasians 68.5%; and Hispanics 5.7%.

9. Students with deficient English skills who took remedial English at LRCCD before transferring to UCD have considerably lower grade point averages than those students who did not take remedial English.

   Of the students who took remedial English at LRCCD, only 35.2% have a 2.5 or better GPA at UCD. Fifty-nine percent of the non-remedial students have a 2.5 or better GPA. At CSUS, fifty-seven percent of the students who took remedial English at LRCCD have a 2.5 or better GPA. Seventy percent of the non-remedial students have a 2.5 or better.

10. Students with deficient math skills who took remedial math at LRCCD before transferring to UCD and CSUS have higher grade point averages after transferring than those students who took remedial English.

    Of the students who took remedial math at LRCCD, forty-one percent have a 2.5 or better at UCD. Sixty-five percent of the non-remedial students have a 2.5 or better. At CSUS sixty-nine percent of the students who took remedial math at LRCCD have a 2.5 or better GPA. Sixty-six percent of the non-remedial students have a 2.5 or better.

11. Students who were credited to LRCCD persist and receive degrees in approximately the same proportion as other transfer students.

    Transfer graduation rates at UCD average 67% after three years. In Fall 1984, LRCCD transfers showed 65.3% had received the degree and 4.1% were still enrolled. At CSUS in Fall 1984, 42% had received a degree and 14% were still enrolled. The completion percentage for all undergraduates at CSUS is 45%

12. Grade point averages of transfers to UCD and CSUS are lower than the grade point averages of the same group at LRCCD.

    The steady decline of grade point averages occurs as a student progresses from high school, to community college, and then on to the transfer institution. The study group went from a 3.23 in LRCCD to a 2.65 at UCD. Those who were high school eligible showed a slightly higher grade point average of 2.76, as did the students credited to LRCCD who earned an average 2.75.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

1. Additional research should study the group of students who were not high school eligible to attend UCD and CSUS and who have attended LRCCD and other colleges. These students may be a high risk group of students who will need more attention and help if they are to successfully complete a four-year college.

2. Profiles of successful students and those who were not successful should be developed to determine what characteristics might be associated with success.

3. Carefully designed cohort comparison groups should be studied to determine what effect attendance at community college has on a student's achievement and persistence at UCD.

4. The different segments should review their methods for crediting students to check consistency and accuracy of reporting among all segments.

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

TRANSFER STUDY RESEARCH AGENDA

Component #1 Transcript Study-Community College Students	Component #2 Transcript Study-CSUS/UC Students	Component #3 Survey-Community College Students: Reverse Transfer and Other Student Groups
1. Describe student flow from high school to community college. 2. Describe flow from community college to community college. 3. Develop an operational definition(s) of the transfer student based on actual behavior. 4. Validate profiles of California Statewide Longitudinal Study. 5. Make projections about types of students served.	1. Describe student flow between community college and four-year institutions. 2. Describe student progress toward degree goals. 3. Describe characteristics of community college transfers who complete baccalaureate degree. 4. Describe characteristics of community college transfers who do not complete baccalaureate degree. 5. Describe characteristics of native students who complete baccalaureate degree. 6. Describe characteristics of native students who do not complete baccalaureate degree. 7. Determine the relative importance of each of the factors as they differentiate between baccalaureate completers and lateral transfers.	1. Describe and compare the demographic characteristics of the reverse transfer population with the demographic characteristics of other student groups. 2. Compare and determine the relative importance of students' reasons for leaving the institution previously attended. 3. Describe and determine the relative importance of students' reasons for leaving the institution previously attended.
METHOD		
1. Data collection from community college transcripts. 2. In-depth interview of those students who exhibit the behavior of transfer students.	1. Data collection from transcripts of BA completers/lateral transfer groups.	1. Survey community college students: a. Those with experience in four-year institutions b. Those with no experience in four-year institutions.

PROPOSED PLAN

TRANSFER STUDY - PHASE II

BACKGROUND

The proposed study grew out of a number of meetings between UCD, CSUS, and Los Rios personnel which explored the feasibility of cooperatively collecting and analyzing information about students transferring from Los Rios community colleges to CSUS and UCD as juniors.

The study was initially conceived as part of a larger research agenda developed by the Commission on Research of the California Association of Community Colleges which is attached to this proposal.

In Spring 1982, the Reverse Transfer section of the agenda was completed within the Los Rios District. It is now being implemented in other community colleges within the state.

The current project will be pilot tested by UCD, CSUS, and Los Rios and then redesigned for use in other community colleges and universities within the state. In devising questions for this study, we have considered that our research may serve not only to give us better information about transfer student performance, but also serve to define issues and delineate measurement problems inherent in any geographically expanded study of transfers among public colleges in California.

STUDY QUESTIONS

Major study questions involve patterns of enrollment, transfer, and academic performance of students who transfer from Los Rios community colleges to UCD and CSUS as juniors. Specific questions include:

1. Patterns of Enrollment

   A. When a transfer student enters UCD and CSUS, the student is "credited" to a particular college of previous attendance. For example, a student attending American River College for two years and then transferring would be "credited" to American River College. However, what happens when a student attends more than one community college or is concurrently enrolled at the community college and four-year college? Which college is credited? How do CSUS and UCD define students' source schools; and what, if any, effect do these definitions have on the enumeration of transfer students? Do community college students who transfer to UCD or CSUS as juniors complete their first two years at one school or a variety of schools?

B. Were community college transfers generally part-time or full-time students while they were enrolled at the community college? How long has it taken them to become juniors (as defined by UCD and CSUS)? Is time to degree related to academic performance? Are part-time community college students more or less successful than full-time students, after they transfer to UCD or CSUS?

C. How much of the coursework at the community college is typically credited toward a degree at the four-year college?

D. Are the answers to these questions different for students who are and are not eligible to attend UCD and/or CSUS after high school graduation?

2. Persistence and Academic Performance of Transfer (versus native) Students

A. What is the academic performance of community college transfers both at the community college prior to transfer and the four-year college after transfer? Are most transfer students eligible for the four-year college from high school, or are most made eligible through community college attendance? How many are special admits?

B. Is there any difference in the performance of community college students at the senior institution which might be attributed to the course of study they take at the community college? Does the major field of study make a difference? Do remedial courses make a difference? Does the vocational track as opposed to the liberal arts track make a difference?

C. How does academic performance of community college transfers at the four-year schools compare to that of comparable native students?

STUDY RESPONSIBILITIES

1. UCD and CSUS will each generate a tape of all new Fall 1979 enrollees' names and social security numbers. UCD's tape will also include Fall 1980 students. Any previous schools attended that can be identified by computer will be included on this initial UCD tape, as will all relevant data elements initially available on CUF (UCD's longitudinal student history file).

2. The Los Rios district will match these records against its cumulative enrollment files to produce two new tapes of matched records (one for CSUS and one for UCD) plus relevant community college enrollment and academic performance data. Unmatched students which UCD and CSUS identified as coming from Los Rios will be investigated at that point

by staff at Los Rios and UCD/CSUS; the unmatched cases will be added to the Los Rios tapes if appropriate. Discrepancies between Los Rios' accounting of transfers and that of UCD and CSUS will be documented at this point.

3. The Los Rios tapes of matched students will be sent to UCD and CSUS where high school total GPA will be added to the tapes. Because a hand search of UCD admissions files will be necessary to gather high school GPA information, a search for missing data available only in admissions files or on the Student Record System (SRS) will be instituted at this time. Completed tapes will be returned to Los Rios.

4. Data analysis and report writing will be performed at Los Rios, with consultation from UCD and CSUS researchers. (Specific cost estimates are attached)

ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

1. Lack of a valid measure of academic ability that is archived at both UCD and CSUS.

2. Uncertainty as to whether total high school GPA is even minimally suitable as a common measure of academic ability.

3. Uncertainty about the selection of a comparable sample of native students for the academic performance comparison.

4. Whether the information gained from high school GPA is valuable enough as a measure to warrant the time and expense involved in obtaining it.

OUTCOMES

1. A final report will be written and published jointly by Los Rios, UCD, and CSUS. This report, or a summary, will be shared with other colleges and universities within California as well as interested state agencies.

2. Information obtained about performance will be shared with community college divisions and counseling staffs, respective university staff, and statewide offices.

3. Based on the report and sessions with outside reviewers, two sets of recommendations will be formulated.

   A. Specific recommendations for strengthening the transfer students chances for success (which may apply to the community colleges or the four-year universities).

B. Specific recommendations concerning daca collection and analysis as related to ongoing studies of academic performance of transfer student.

SPECIFIC COST ESTIMATES

UCD

1. Generation of tapes for new 1979 and 1980 students from the Composite Undergraduate File (CUF). Approximate cost for programmer time, analyst time, and computer charges is $250. Computer time alone, however, will cost less than $50.

2. Adding gross HSGPA and other data not on CUF to the Los Rios-produced tape:

   A. manual search of admissions files for approximately 250 student records

   B. manual and/or computer search for SRS data not on CUF,

   C. adding information to existing tape provided by Los Rios

   These steps will require approximately four hours of programmer time at SARI, 20-40 hours of admissions staff time to locate records and record data, 10 hours of data entry work, and an unknown amount of clerical time to locate and record missing data. A minimal estimate for the cost of staff time is $180. Costs for computer time are unknown because the extent to which the SRS must be used is unknown.

CSUS

Projected costs include:

1. Tape produced of CSUS transfer students -- $50

2. Computer time - not charged

3. Clerical time for searching student records--approximately 100 transfer and 1000 native students. Estimate -- $432

LOS RIOS

1. Tape produced of Los Rios students -- $50

2. Computer technician -- $350

3. Clerical time - searching student records -- $200

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT - EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

SOURCE SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION

(Formerly Charge Rules)

These guidelines and rules are intended to help evaluators identify the school having final responsibility for a student's eligibility or ineligibility and are to be used in conjunction with working rules for admission. Schools need to be identified for a variety of reports, including reports for the Director of Admissions, the Director of Relations with Schools, and the Department of Finance.

I. Admitted Students

A. General Guidelines for identifying source schools.

1. In general, the institution having the greater or greatest responsibility for the applicant's eligibility should be identified as the source school, and the school code should be entered as "School Charged". If it is evident from the record that no one institution is responsible, no school should be charged. Identify the last acceptable school, where transferable work was completed, as the source school by entering the school code for that school as "Last School Attended". Make no entry for "School Charged".

2. Summer Session. If the last work completed by the applicant was in summer session or summer session Extension and the work is not needed to establish eligibility, identify the last institution attended in regular session as the source school. Enter the code for that school as "School Charged". If the summer session work is needed to establish eligibility, identify the summer session as the source school.

3. Extension. If the last work completed by the applicant was in Extension and the work is not needed to establish eligibility, identify the last institution attended in regular session as the source school. Enter the code for that school as "School Charged". If the extension work is needed to establish eligibility, identify extension as the source school.

4. Grades at last school not used - e.g. unaccredited institution, professional school, service credit. If the grades from the last school or college were not used in determining eligibility, do not identify this school as the source school unless work at this school is considered to be reason for admission by Special Action. Identify the previous institution as the source school, and enter that code as "School Charged".

5. Phrase "12 or more units" --- Wherever the phrase "12 or more units" occurs in these instructions, it means 12 or more transferable units attempted. The phrase refers to either semester or quarter units, depending upon the system under which the previous institution operated.

B. Rules for identifying source school.

1. High School - Applicants presenting no advanced standing credit earned in regular session after high school graduation.

a. High school eligible - If admission requirements were satisfied by high school work taken prior to graduation, the high school granting the diploma is the source school. Enter the code of the graduating high school as "School Charged".

b. CEEB eligible - Applicants admitted on the basis of CEEB examinations alone should be assigned to CEEB. "CEEB Examinations" should be indicated as the method of admission and the code of the high school entered as "Last School Attended".

c. California High School Proficiency Examination graduates (CPE) Applicants graduated on the basis of the CPE are not charged to the high school. The high school code should be entered as "Last School Attended"; the proficiency examination code should appear as "High School Graduated From"; the graduation date is the date the student passed the examination.

d. Special Action - Applicants admitted as exceptions to the rules (Special Action) should be assigned to Special Action. Special Action should be indicated as the method of admission and the code of the graduating high school entered as "Last School Attended".

e. Unapproved California High School - (An unapproved school is one that does not have a list of certified courses on file with the Director of Admissions).

(1) Admission approved by Systemwide Director of Admissions. If the admission of an applicant from an unapproved school is approved by the Systemwide Director of Admissions, charge the case to the high school. Enter the high school code as "School Charged". (Note: the applicant must have met regular subject, scholarship, and test requirements).

(2) Admission approved by campus admissions officer. If the student is admitted by special action of the campus admissions officer, do not charge the high school. "Special Action" should be indicated as the method of admission and the code of the graduating high school entered as "Last School Attended".

f. Clearing a subject ommission on the basis of a College Board subject examination

(1) If the test is taken prior to high school graduation, enter the high school code as "School Charged."

(2) If the test is taken after high school graduation, enter the high school code as "Last School Attended."

g. EAXP - Students admitted for concurrent enrollment in the University prior to high school graduation are not charged to the high school at this time. Enter the code of the high school in which the student is enrolled as "Last School Attended."

2. College credit earned prior to high school graduation

a. In the University of California - EAXP after high school graduation. If a student transfers after high school graduation to a UC campus other than the one at which he was enrolled as an EAXP student, treat as a high school evaluation, and charge the high school. Enter the code of the graduating high school as "School Charged." Enter the UC work separately. (Exception: If the student does not meet H.S. admission requirements, enter the code of the graduating high school as "Last School Attended"). Note: the record of an EAXP student who continues as a full time student at the same campus after high school graduation should also be charged to the high school. Procedures for capturing this information should be developed.

b. In collegiate institutions other than U.C. - If a student has college credit earned prior to graudation at another accredited institution, charge the case to the high school regardless of the number of college units attempted. Enter the code of the graduating high school as "School Charged." Enter the college credit separately. (Exception: If a student has been registered as a regular full-time student at a collegiate institution for a full year prior to high school graduation, charge the collegiate institution, e.g., USC and UC early admission programs).

c. In AP Programs and/or CLEP - Credit earned through the Advanced Placement Program (AP) or the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) has no effect on school charged. Charge the case according to appropriate rule.

3. Advanced Standing transfers - College credit earned after high school graduation.

a. Cases presenting a clear high school record:

(1) 12 or more units at one institution - If the applicant has attempted 12 or more units since high school graduation, identify the last acceptable institution in which he attempted 12 or more units as the source school and enter the code as "School Charged."

(2) Less than 12 units - If the applicant has attempted less than 12 units since high school graduation, charge the case to the high school. Enter the code of the graduating high school as "School Charged" and the college code as "Last School Attended."

(3) Less than 12 units at any one institution - If the applicant attempted 12 or more units but has not attempted at least 12 units in any one institution, no school can be charged. Identify the last acceptable school attended as the source school and enter the code as "Last School Attended."

(4) Less than C average at last institution - If the applicant has attended regular session in a number of institutions with a satisfactory overall GPA but has attempted 12 or more units with less than a C average in the last one, identify the last school as the source school and enter the code as "Last School Attended."

(5) Special Action - Applicants admitted as exceptions to the rules (Special Action) should be assigned to Special Action. Enter the last college attended as "Last School Attended."

b. Applicants presenting subject omissions only, cleared by college courses taken after high school graduation

(1) 12 or more units attempted - If 12 or more units were attempted after high school graduation, identify the last acceptable institution where 12 units were attempted as the source school and enter the code as "School Charged."

(2) Less than 12 units attempted - If less than 12 units were attempted after high school graduation, identify the last acceptable school attended as the source school and enter the code as "Last School Attended."

c. Applicants presenting high school scholarship deficiencies (with or without subject deficiencies)

(1) If 12 or more units were attempted at the last acceptable institution, enter the code for that institution as "School Charged."

(2) If less than 12 units were attempted at the last acceptable institution, but the student was eligible prior to attending that institution, enter code for previous school as "School Charged." Enter the code for last school as "Last School Attended."

(3) If less than 12 units were attempted at the last acceptable institution, but the units were required to establish eligibility, enter the code for the last school as "Last School Attended."

4. Credit earned in foreign institutions and American institutions in foreign countries

   a. Foreign credentials - Regular charge rules apply (HS/Transfer). Report the country, city, institution and credential or diploma. Enter the code for the country as "School Charged" or "Last School Attended."

   b. Records from American institutions in foreign countries - Regular charge rules apply. Enter the code for American institutions in foreign countries as the "School Charged" or "Last School Attended."

5. Applicants who have been registered in regular session on another campus of the University

   a. Intercampus Transfer (ICT). If the student transfers directly from one general campus of the University to another, identify the campus last attended as the source school and enter the code as "School Charged." (Exception: EAXP after high school graduation.)

   b. Transfers from another collegiate institution. If a student who has attended a university campus subsequently transfers from another collegiate institution, enter the code of that school as "Last School Attended."

   c. Transfers who withdrew from UC campus without completing any work. If a student withdrew from a UC campus without completing any work, enter the code for the previous school as "School Charged" or "Last School Attended" in accordance with the regular rules.

6. Limited, Special, 2nd Baccalaureate. Enter school code as "Last School Attended." For 2nd Baccalaureate, enter code for school where first degree was received.

II. Deferred Students - In general, the last school attended is considered the source school regardless of number of units attempted. Identify the last school and enter the code as "Last School Attended." Exception: If courses and grades from the last institution attended were not considered in determining an applicant's admissibility, e.g., unaccredited institution, identify the last acceptable institution, high school or college, as the source school and enter that code as "Last School Attended." (Pertains mainly to transfer students.)

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
SEP 20 1985